



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,502	03/10/2005	Shinichi Handa	920_021	9949
25191	7590	01/22/2009	EXAMINER	
BURR & BROWN			WON, BUMSUK	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	
SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068			PAPER NUMBER	
			2889	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			01/22/2009	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/527,502

Applicant(s)

HANDA ET AL.

Examiner

BUMSUK WON

Art Unit

2889

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 24 December 2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11-23.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Toan Ton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2889

/B. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2889

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11-23, the applicant argues that Yasunori and Miyake have no reason to combine, and even if combined, the references would still not disclose all features recited in the independent claims. It appears the applicant has two arguments: (1) Yasunori and Miyake have no reason to combine because Miyake does not improve contrast when combined with Yasunori; and (2) neither Yasunori nor Miyake discloses the recited claim limitation - insulating layer pattern.

Regarding the first argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Yasunori discloses an insulating layer 8 in figure 2, however, the figure only shows a 2 dimensional view of the EL element; therefore, Yasunori does not specifically disclose a patterned feature of the insulating layer 8. On the other hand, Miyake discloses an EL element with an insulating layer 5 in various figures, specifically in figures 1 and 3. In figure 1 of Miyake, the insulating layer 5 is patterned in a grid pattern (note paragraph 33) such that the layer 5 would enhance the contrast. In other words, Yasunori does not specifically disclose how the insulating layer 8 is patterned while Miyake discloses the insulating layer 5 is patterned in a grid pattern, thereby enhancing the contrast. Accordingly, the examiner maintains the rejection in regards to this argument. Regarding the second argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant further argues that the functionality provided in the insulating layer pattern (note page 4 of the applicant's remark filed on 12/24/2008) of the instant application cannot be accomplished by the basic black matrix layers of either Yasunori or Miyake. While the applicant's allegation may be true, such functionality is not structurally recited in the claims. Accordingly, the examiner maintains the rejection in regards to this argument.

With all the reasons above, the examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).